

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant appreciates the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Final Office Action of September 2, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully noted. By this amendment, claim 5 has been amended and claims 1-17 are currently pending in the application. Support for these amendments are provided in at least Figures 4 and related text of the specification. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the rejected claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested because it places the present application in condition for allowance, or in the alternative, better form for appeal. In view of the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Claims 6-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,149,213 issued to Rosner, *et al.* ("Rosner"). Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Rosner in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0065045 issued to Kim. Claims 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Rosner in view of Kim and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0024433 issued to Vanttinen. Claims 12-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Rosner in view of Vanttinen. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

The Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation. A prior art reference anticipates the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of the claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. MPEP § 2131; *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832,

15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566,1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131; *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 619,621 (Fed. Cir. 1985). In addition, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as each and every feature of the claimed invention has not been established either singly or in combination.

In particular, independent claims 1, 6 and 7 are allowable as these claims recite a combination of features, including *inter alia*,

a storage unit storing: a descriptor table comprising for each descriptor: a pointer field to point to a definition of an operation to be carried out by said interface during the frame processing, an absolute operation time field indicating at which time from the beginning of the frame processing the corresponding operation should be carried out by said interface, an operation definition table comprising for each operation a definition of the operation, each definition having a sequence of events to be executed by the interface in order to carry out said operation, each event of the definition table being associated with a relative event time field indicating at which time from the beginning of the operation the corresponding event should be executed

The Office purports these features are taught by Rosner. However, the Office fails to particularly identify each of the foregoing features. Rather, the Office points broadly to various columns and lines of Rosner on page 10 of the Office Action. Upon review of these sections there is no teaching or suggestion of the foregoing features.

For example, the Office points to various background sections col. 1, ll. 63-66 which discloses a WLAN module implementing a 802.11 MAC and PHY protocols. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of the foregoing features. In addition, the Office points to col. 2, ll. 25-36, disclosing in part RAM module and also failing to disclose the foregoing features. Moreover, the referenced lines in the office action at cols. 3, 8, 9, 10, 12 and 13 have also been reviewed and also fail to disclose the

foregoing features. In addition, neither Kim nor Vanttinen cure the deficiencies of Rosner. Accordingly, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation or obviousness with regard to the foregoing features.

In addition, Applicant continues to traverse the rejection for similar reasons as discussed in the June 16, 2008 response. In particular, the invention saves storage and processing by performing a particular operation more than once from a same definition in the operation definition table pointed to by a pointer during the processing of and in synchronism with one signal data frame. The Office has simply failed to establish these features in the rejection.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-17. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 6 and 7, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable.

In view of all of the above, the claims are now believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

No fee is believed due for this submittal. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

November 3, 2008



Scott J. Hawranek, No. 52,411
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(719) 448-5920 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax